

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENT**

### Description of amendments

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 21, and 23-25 are currently amended. Claims 1-5, 7-21, and 23-25 are pending after entry of this Amendment. No new matter is introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination in view of the foregoing claim amendments and remarks presented below.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, the Examiner states that “[i]t is unclear whether the claims require the reservoirs to include the claimed coating material.” To overcome these rejections, claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite “a solvent contained in a solvent reservoir” and “a polymer contained in a polymer reservoir.”

Regarding claims 1, 5, and 21, the Examiner states that “it is unclear whether applicants claim a stent coating apparatus or a stent coating system.” To overcome these rejections, claims 1, 5, and 21 have been amended to recite “A stent coating system.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that claims 6, 7, and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all the of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As indicated above, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has also been amended to include the subject matter of claim 6, which is now canceled. Claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 1, instead of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, and 21 are patentably allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 22, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Cassanmagnago (US 3,232,540).

Claim 22 has been canceled, rendering its rejection moot.

Claims 23 and 25 have been amended so as to depend from claim 21. As indicated above, claim 21 is patentably allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22 and 25 are patentably allowable for at least the same reason as claim 21.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

I.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassanmagnago (US 3,232,540) and Coffman (US 3,049,439).

As mentioned above, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 6 (now canceled), which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has done so by rewriting claim 6 into claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably allowable.

Claims 4, 8, and 10 depend from claim 1 and are patentably allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1 is patentably allowable.

Independent claim 5 has been amended to include all the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentably allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1 is patentably allowable.

II.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassanmagnago (US 3,232,540) and Coffman (US 3,049,439) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Leidner et al. (US 6,056,993).

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. As indicated above, claim 1 is patentably allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3 are patentably allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

III.

Claims 9 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassanmagnago (US 3,232,540) and Coffman (US 3,049,439) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Kaneko et al. (US 5,249,746).

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, and claim 24 has been amended to depend from claim 21. As indicated above, claims 1 and 21 are patentably allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 24 are patentably allowable for at least the same reason as claims 1 and 21, respectively.


Conclusion

In light of the foregoing claim amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1850.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 20, 2007

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.  
One Maritime Plaza  
Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Facsimile (415) 393-9887  
Telephone (415) 954-0241  
nmorales@ssd.com

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Norman Morales  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 55,463